

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/767,522
Confirmation No.: 5541
First-Named Inventor: Roe
Filing Date: January 29, 2004
Group Art Unit: 3736
Examiner: Lloyd, Emily M.
Attorney Docket No.: 007404-000547
Title: INTEGRATED LANCING TEST STRIP

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
INCLUDING INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the Notice of Allowance. An Interview Summary and Comments on Reasons for Allowance have been provided below.

Interview Summary

On January 23, 2008, the Examiner contacted the undersigned to authorize the claim and specification amendments as presented in the Examiner's Amendment attached to the Notice of Allowance. The undersigned representative authorized the amendments.

Subsequently, on February 4, 2008, the Examiner contacted the undersigned to indicate that there was a possible obviousness double patenting issue with respect to claim 54 and US Patent No. 7,322,942. In response, the Applicant filed a Terminal Disclaimer in order to obviate any obviousness type double patenting rejections.

Comments On Statement Of Reasons For Allowance

The Applicant submits and agrees that the pending claims are allowable over the prior art. However, applicant specifically reserves the right to pursue different and/or broader claims in other applications.

In the Notice of Allowability, the Examiner included statements regarding reasons for allowance of the claims. Applicant agrees that the prior art of record fails to teach or render obvious the claims pending in the present application. However, applicant submits that any statement of reasons for allowance necessarily contains characterizations of the claims or of the prior art which cannot adequately indicate the bases for allowance of the claims. Accordingly, applicant submits that the stated reasons for allowance do not adequately describe the applicant's invention as claimed, or the reasons that the claims are allowable over the prior art.

Each claim is allowable because each claim recites a combination of elements not disclosed or suggested by any of the references, taken alone or in combination. The invention resides in the combination of elements as variously recited in the claims, and not in the presence of any one or a few particular elements or limitations. Further, it is to be understood that each claim stands on its own merits.

Applicant therefore does not acquiesce to any inference or presumption which may be drawn from the Examiner's statements regarding the reasons for allowance. As stated in the MPEP at 1302.14, "[t]he examiner's statement of reasons for allowance is the personal opinion of the examiner as to why the claims are allowable [and the] examiner's statement should not create an estoppel."

Respectfully submitted,

By /Charles P. Schmal #45,082/
Charles P. Schmal, Reg. No. 45082
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456